

### **Remarks**

This is in response to the Office Action of January 11, 2012.

To expedite the prosecution, claims 82, 83, 87, 88, 92 and 93 have been canceled, and claims 80, 90, 95 and 97-108 have been amended for clarification.

In item 12 of the Office Action, the examiner states: "the examiner would like to note that claims 85, 90 and 95 do not recite a pattern of said scores, but instead only recite a pattern of scores of said contents". In response to this argument raised by the examiner, claims 85, 90 and 95 have been amended to recite "wherein an arrangement of said contents is determined on the basis of a pattern of said scores with respect to a time axis".

Furthermore, claims 90 has been amended to change the term "memory" to "information storage unit" in accordance with the terminology used in the specification.

Claims 82, 85, 87, 90, 92 and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US 2003/0114968) ('Sato') in view of Barton (US 2011/0078035) ('Barton'). Claims 83, 88 and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Barton and further in view of Chasen et al. (US 6,760,721) ('Chasen'). Claims 97, 98, 100-102, 104-106 and 108 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Barton and further in view of Chatfield (US 2003/0227478) ('Chatfield'). Claims 99, 100, 103, 104, 107 and 108 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Barton and further in view of Yasushi et al. (US 2004/0128286) ('Yasushi').

To the extent that the rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections per the following.

Claims 85, 90 and 95

Amended claims 85, 90 and 95 each include the features of "said constraint condition solution unit creates said program table on the basis of a correlation between said contents, by referring scores set with respect to said plurality of contents according to user's preference information" and "said temporal arrangement of said contents within said program table is determined on the basis of a pattern of said scores with respect to a time axis".

Namely, amended claims 85, 90 and 95 each include the subject matter of "said temporal arrangement of said contents within said program table is determined on the basis of a pattern of said scores (which are set with respect to said plurality of contents according to user's preference information) with respect to a time axis".

As to the above subject matter recited in claims 85, 90 and 95, the examiner states:

"wherein an arrangement of said contents is determined on the basis of a pattern of scores (i.e. priorities) of said plurality of contents with respect to a time axis (Sato, Figures 3 and 5, paragraphs 44-45, 47 and 77)" (at Page 5, Lines 8-10, Page 8, Lines 9-11 of the Office Action) and

"Sato teaches arranging contents based on priorities (or scores) of said plurality of contents with respect to a time axis (paragraphs 44-45, 47 and 77)" (at Page 17, Lines 1-2 of the Office Action).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Sato fails to disclose the above subject matter, as set forth below.

Sato discloses that a program list (Figures 3 and 5) is prepared at the information providing center 10, and the driver may specify the area and the time period for obtaining weather information, the area and the traveling direction for obtaining traffic information, a category of news he wishes to listen to, or the type of music he wishes to listen to (paragraph 0040).

However, Sato fails to disclose how to determine a temporal arrangement of the contents information within the program list.

According to Sato, in the program number section of the program list (Figures 3 and 5), the order in which the contents information is to be played at the vehicle is indicated (0045 and 0077). However, Sato is silent about how to determine the order in which the contents information is to be played.

Sato discloses "In the event section of the program list in FIG. 3, a time point specified by the driver at which specific contents information is to be played is indicated." (0047). The above disclosure may indicate that the order in which the contents information is to be played can be determined by the driver.

However, Sato clearly fails to disclose that the order in which the contents information is to be played on the basis of a pattern of said scores (which are set with respect to said plurality of contents according to user's preference information) with respect to a time axis.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Sato fails to disclose the subject matter of "said temporal arrangement of said contents within said program table is determined on the basis of a pattern of said scores with respect to a time axis", as recited in claims 85, 90 and 95.

Therefore, claims 85, 90 and 95 and all claims dependent therefrom are submitted to be novel and inventive over Sato and Barton.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of this application by the examiner is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Louis Woo/

Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730  
Law Offices of Louis Woo  
717 North Fayette Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone: (703) 299-4090

Date: April 4, 2012